

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Enited States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Brot. 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 WWW.Usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/673.074	02/26/2001	William John Armitage	HASLP004 9378			
22434	7590 07/14/2004		EXAMINER			
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP			FAY, ZOHREH A			
P.O. BOX 778 BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
DIMMELLI	C41 > 77 V V V V V		1614			

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application	Application No.		Applicant(s)			
		09/673,07	' 4	ARMITAGE ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Zohreh Fa	ау	1614				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
2a) <u></u>	,	his action is n						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims								
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	4) Claim(s) 1-7,9-17 and 19 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-7, 9-17, 19 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers							
	The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
2) Notice 3) Infor	nt(s) Dee of References Cited (PTO-892) Dee of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB er No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:)-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/673,074

Art Unit: 1614

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7and 9-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Lindstrom et al. (U.S. patent 4,725,586). Lindstrom et al. teach the use of bicarbonate in combination with HEPES in an ophthalmic irrigating composition. See column 3, lines 27-38. The addition of the phrase "consisting essentially of" for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the office action of March 09, 2004 does not create a patently distinct composition. Applicant has the burden of showing that introduction of additional steps or components would materially change the nature of the invention.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindstrom et al. (U.S. patent 4,725,586) and Lang et al. (U.S. Patent 5,403,841).

Lindstrom et al. teach the use of bicarbonate and HEPES in an ophthalmic irrigating solution being used during ophthalmic surgery. See column 3, lines 27-38.

Lang et al. Teach the use of autoclave for sterilizing ophthalmic formulation as old. See page 6, example 1. The primary reference differs from the claimed invention in autoclaving the ophthalmic irrigating solution. It would have been obvious to a person

Art Unit: 1614

skilled in the art to use autoclaving for ophthalmic solutions, considering that Lang et al. teach autoclaving in ophthalmic formulations as old and well known.

One skilled in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of the above references, since one relates to the use of the claimed components, bicarbonate and HEPES in an ophthalmic irrigating solution, and the other relates to autoclaving for sterilizing ophthalmic composition as old and well known. To use autoclaving for sterilizing any ophthalmic formulations would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art in the absence of evidence to the contrary. Applicant has presented no evidence to establish the unexpected or unobvious nature of the claimed invention, and as such, claim 19 is properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zohreh Fay whose telephone number is (571) 272-0573. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low can be reached on (571) 272-0951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/673,074 Page 4

Art Unit: 1614

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Z.F

